

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 34, 44 and 64-69 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 70-82 have been added.

Claims 70-82 are pending for the Examiner's consideration.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, in light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Amendments of Claims

In order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants have canceled Claims 34, 44 and 64-69 without prejudice. Cancellation of Claims 34, 44 and 64-69 does not constitute any admission regarding the subject matter of Claims 34, 44 and 64-69. Applicants reserve a right to pursue the subject matter of Claims 34, 44 and 64-69 in this or other application(s).

Applicants have added new Claims 70-82. Support for Claims 70-82 can be found, through the originally-filed application, for example, in the originally-filed Claims 1-15 and paragraphs [0053]-[0054]. As such, no new matter is added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter these amendments.

For the reasons that follow, Applicants believe all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Claim Objections

Claim 34 was objected to because of the informalities set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. In light of cancellation of Claim 34, these objections are moot. Applicants respectfully submit the objections do not apply to the claims now pending and should be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, the first paragraph

Claims 34, 44 and 64-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, the first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants have canceled Claims 34, 44 and 64-69. In light of cancellation of Claims 34, 44 and 64-69, this rejection is moot. Applicants respectfully submit the rejection does not apply to the claims now pending and should be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 34, 44 and 64-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being obvious over Tang et al., U.S. 6,573,293 and as evidence by Abramson et al., Rheumatology 2002; 41:972-980. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants have canceled Claims 34, 44 and 64-69. In light of cancellation of Claims 34, 44 and 64-69, this rejection is moot. Applicants respectfully submit the rejection does not apply to the claims now pending and should be withdrawn.

Applicants note that citing Tang et al., the Office Action erroneously states the following: "Tang et al., however, fail to teach the fluorinated form of the compound." (the first sentence of the last paragraph at page 5). However, Tang et al. teaches, for example, example 80 (col. 70); example

28 (col. 32); example 134 (col.102); example 138 (col.105); example 129 (col. 109); example132 (col. 111); example 145 (col.114); example150 (col. 118), etc.

Conclusion

Applicants believe all claims are now in condition for allowance. Should there be any issues that have not been addressed to the Examiner's satisfaction, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney.

If any fees other than those submitted herewith are due in connection with this response, including the fee for a Request for Continued Examination, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 161445.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 28, 2008

/Galina M. Yakovleva/
Galina M. Yakovleva, Ph.D.
Attorney For Applicants
Registration No. 47,192

Pfizer Inc.
Legal Division/Patent Department
10555 Science Center Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Phone: (858) 622-6095
Fax: (858) 678-8233